IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

LPA No. 567 of 2026
Date of decision: 05.11.2026

Yuvraj Rajyadhayksh ...Appellant

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ...Respondents

Coram
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice G. S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice.
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bipin C. Negi, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Appellant: Mr. Vivek Singh Attri, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Harsh Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel, for the respondents-UoI.

G. S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice (Oral)

Consideration is sought to the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge in ***CWP No. 11695 of 2026***, titled as ***Yuvraj Rajyadhayksh vs. Union of India & Ors.,*** on 14.09.2026.

2. The appellant is aggrieved against the dismissal of the writ petition, wherein he had prayed for setting aside the communication dated 07.05.2026 (Annexure P-VII), whereby he had not been selected in the interview for the PhD programme in the Organizational Behaviour & Human Resource Management, in the Indian Institute of Management, Sirmaur.

3. The learned Single Judge after careful consideration of the pleadings, came to the conclusion that there was a selection process, which was in four stages and the petitioner as

2026:HHC:49165

such having been found eligible, had participated in the first stage alongwith six other candidates. However, in the second stage of the personal interview, when he was interviewed by the Committee, he was not found fit and as such was declared '*not selected*' and, therefore, was not called for the third round. Only four selected candidates were considered in the third round interview for offering letter of admission against the two seats in the concerned area for the Academic Session 2026-31. Resultantly, the learned Single Judge found that mainly on account of the one seat remained unfilled, the petitioner could not stake his claim as he had not cleared the second round of interview.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant has tried to convince us that since the candidates did not join the said course, the appellant should have been offered admission being *sixth* in the merit list prepared.

5. We are of the considered opinion that the said argument is not liable to be accepted as the appellant has no indefeasible right as such to be admitted in the said course, if he has not cleared the second round of the personal interview with the said Committee.

6. Merely because the other candidates, over and above him, have not joined and one seat remained vacant and the respondents as such had also prepared a certain list for the

2026:HHC:49165

fifth candidate or the wait list as such, which would be clear from the information received under Right to Information Act, does not change the categorical stand as such of the official-respondents that he was not selected and was never included in the waiting list.

7. In such circumstances, merely on account of the fact that the selected candidates did not join the course, including the candidate of the wait list, would not give indefeasible right as such to the appellant to seek admission on this basis. The right as such was only of consideration. Since the appellant having not found favour with the Selection Committee as such as per the terms of the prospectus, never progressed to the 3rd round, cannot contend to the contrary since the selection process was laid down for all the candidates uniformly.

8. In such circumstances, we are of the considered opinion that view taken by the learned Single Judge does not suffer from any infirmity so as to warrant interference in the present Letters Patent Appeal.

9. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed, so also the pending applications, if any.

(G. S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice

(Bipin C. Negi)
Judge

5th November, 2026
(sanjeev)